

Tomás Albaladejo and Francisco Chico-Rico, "Translation, style and poetics". In: Sue-Ann Harding and Ovidi Carbonell Cortés (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*. London/New York: Routledge, 2018: 115-133 (ISBN: 978-1-138-94630-9).

TRANSLATION, STYLE AND POETICS

Tomás Albaladejo

Francisco Chico-Rico

Translated from the Spanish by the authors.

1. Introduction: translating literature

Literature, as an art of language or artistic language construction, is characterised by a series of peculiarities which distinguish it from other forms of linguistic communication, shaping the texts which materialise as linguistic objects where special attention is paid to language, both in terms of its production and reception. The translation of literature will consequently involve ensuring that the target text, i.e. the text written in the target language, which is also referred to as 'text-translation,' maintains as much as possible the linguistic characteristics of the source text, i.e. the text written in the source language, that which is being translated. The transfer of such literary features becomes essential for the translation of a literary text to remain a literary text, one showing the features, characteristics or peculiarities thanks to which it will be received and valued as having that status. Translation and, of course, literary translation have no doubt an essential textual dimension since translators have the idea that they are translating texts, not only sentences, and consequently they achieve the translation of each sentence or each paragraph as a part of an upper linguistic unit: the text (Petöfi 1975, 125-7; 1982; 1991; De Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, 216-7; Tonfoni 1982). Translation is a linguistic operation, but it also implies extralinguistic aspects (Mounin 1963, 16-7). Text is the linguistic unit where these extralinguistic aspects converge in communication (Chico-Rico 1987).

Russian formalism provided the notion of ‘literariness’—*literaturnost*—to explain the artistic specificity of literary texts as opposed to non-literary ones, along with what can be described as typical when it comes to the communication of literary works compared to that of non-literary texts (García-Berrio 1973; 1979; Cohen 1974; Pozuelo 1988; Albaladejo and Chico-Rico 1994). In this respect, it is literariness that characterises a verbal work of art and makes it possible for the latter to be integrated into an artistic communication structure—within a system of social actions (Schmidt 1980) or in a historically constituted literary system (Even-Zohar 1990) where literature exists both as a form of communication and as a social institution—of a verbal nature, in which it is recognised as a work of art. The literariness of a verbal work of art thus spreads from that work to all the components involved in the literary event—the author who produces it, the recipient who interprets it, the referent, the production context, the reception and interpretation context, and the code with which it is constructed—becoming part of the former and eventually assuming its characteristics insofar as they belong to such an artistic communication structure.

Literariness, which is the quality as literary that some texts have in their corresponding communication contexts, must be owned by the source text and the target text alike, which entails a requirement that needs to be fulfilled during the translation process: the person who carries out this task must maintain it beyond the source language and its communicative context in the target language and its corresponding communication context. Because literariness characterises the verbal work of art and places it within an artistic communication structure, both authors and recipients are aware of it, and accordingly, also translators, who must perform a dual function with regard to the literary text in their translating activity: they are recipients of the source text, but also producers, or expressed differently, authors of the target text, of the text-translation. Translation is a communicative process and also the result of this process (García Yebra 1984, vol. I, 29).

2. Literary translation as literary mediation

Literary translation, the same as literary criticism or text edition, constitutes a form of literary mediation (Albaladejo 1998). The communicative dimension of literary translation characteristically features the presence of a mediator—the literary translator—between the literary work and the recipient of the translation, thus mediating

between the author of the work being translated and the recipient of the text-translation. This presence is shared by literary criticism as an activity in which the critic acts as an interpreter of the work with the aim of placing it at the disposal of readers while simultaneously issuing a critical assessment about it. Likewise, it is shared by ecdotics, i.e. by the philological activity of text editing which uses the analysis of the variants harboured by a specific handwritten and/or printed tradition to provide the text actually produced by the author (Albaladejo 1986); it is an interpretative task undertaken from a position of mediation between the different existing textual variants of the work and the recipient, who is offered a reconstruction of the text along with a set of notes reflecting the identified and documented variants. In these three cases—literary translation; literary criticism; and text edition—mediators, regardless of whether they are translators, critics or philological editors, carry out an interpretation and communicatively transfer the outcome of their interpretation, which is the text-translation, the critical text or the philological edition, respectively, thus projecting the literary event within which the source text is inserted into other communicative events, within a communication or transmission chain (Doležel 1990, 167-168).

The interpretation performed by the mediator is a transitive one, since it is transmitted to new recipients, those of the text resulting from the interpretation: the interpreter becomes a textual producer and builds a text by means of which s/he acts as a mediator between the original text and those who receive the text constructed from the former. This mediation represents a kind of *transduction* (Doležel 1986; 1990); in other words, the reception of a literary text which serves as a primary text, its interpretation and the production—based on its interpretation—of a different textual object, which could be a literary criticism text, a new literary work or a translation. Transduction means making the new textual object available to recipients who may be identical to those of the primary text or different from them. Claudio Guillén claims in this regard that the translator's task can be compared to the task carried out by a literary critic, insofar as s/he is 'también, en ciertos casos, un crítico minucioso, que aclara y nos ayuda a entender mejor las palabras distantes [also, in certain cases, a meticulous critic, who clarifies and helps us better understand the distant words]' (Guillén 1985, 353).¹ Haroldo de Campos equally links translation to criticism, and to creation too (Campos 1963).

Emilio Betti, a jurist and theorist of Hermeneutics, has reflected on three types of interpretation: interpretation on a cognitive—or recognitive—basis, which consists

of understanding a text or any other linguistic expression; interpretation on a normative basis, which, based on the cognitive one, exerts an influence on the interpreter's behaviour; and interpretation on a reproductive or representative basis, which (also on the basis of cognitive interpretation) results in the production of a new text as a reproduction or representation of the primary text, that is, the subject of cognitive interpretation. Forms of reproductive or representative interpretation include musical execution, theatrical performance and translation (Betti 1975, 40-55). Translation entails what could be depicted as 'going from the text to the text' (Albaladejo 1998); it implies reproduction, since a new text is produced, but also a representation of the source text insofar as the new text occupies its place in the reception of the work in another language (Albaladejo 2006).

The transformation of a literary text created in a certain language into another text written in a different language—the transformation that literary translation involves—will only be successful if the resulting text effectively replaces the source text. To achieve this, the mediation of translation must maintain the literary status—i.e. the literariness—that is characteristic of the source text in such a way so that the latter can properly function as a literary text in its corresponding communication context and suitably represent the text in the original language. Successfully replacing the source text does not imply total identity or equivalence, but rather a partial or restricted equivalence in which similarity and difference are dialectically related (Albaladejo 2004; Pym 2010, 6 ff.). Of course, the fact that the work exists in another language thanks to translation stresses the existence of a significant difference between the work and its translations but it also permits to maintain—as long as the translation is good—the principle of restricted equivalence, both the work and its translations being literary works and the original work being represented by its translations into other languages. It is well known that a great many literary works have been read by more readers in translation than in their original language, and those who have read them in their translated versions can be rightfully considered readers of the literary works to which they have gained access thanks to the mediating activity of their translators. Certainly, for the translated literary work to suitably represent the original literary work, the translation must necessarily be performed by trying to keep the literary features of the original work as much as possible, together with the elements which provide the aesthetic value of the work or its *poeticity*, located by Antonio García-Berrio in the domains of poetic expressiveness, mimetic fictionality and imaginary construction

(García-Berrio 1979; 1985, 49 ff.; 1987; 1992, 20-33, 33-142, 311-480; 1994, 15-6, 28, 42-3, 51-140, 427-70; García-Berrio and Hernández Fernández 1988, 69-71).

3. The transfer of literariness when translating literary works

Literariness is the quality of linguistic objects considered as literary texts. It manifests itself through a use of language or a referential constitution or a communication that are distinguished from the usual ones, which occur in non-literary texts. Thus, literariness is the basis of the differentiation of literary texts from linguistic objects considered as non-literary. The translation of a literary work must transfer the literariness of the original to the text-translation. This involves an action undertaken by the translator that can be regarded as literary at the various levels of the target text in both linguistic (phono-phonological, morphosyntactic, intensional-semantic, extensional-semantic, pragmatic and textual) and semiotic areas (syntactics, semantics and pragmatics [Morris 1971, 21-24]), all of which are textually projected. Semiotics is included in the realm of translation since linguistics is a part of semiotics (De Saussure 1976, 60). As Susan Bassnett explains, translation ‘belongs most properly to *semiotics*’ (2004, 21).

Maintaining literariness in the target text, in the text-translation, represents a condition for what we regard as restricted equivalence between both texts, in such a way that both the original text and the translated one are a literary work resulting from creation (Campos 1963) or even the same literary work, although some clarification needs to be made in relation to this last aspect, regarding the possibility for the translator to become also a re-creator of the work that s/he is translating. Nevertheless, it is worth highlighting the fact that whoever translates a literary work, despite exercising literary creativity, has limited possibilities when it comes to creation, insofar as s/he must stick to the literary text being translated, which has already been created by its author (Paz 1971). The fact that the translation, as an act of linguistic production carried out by the translator, stems from a previous text, produced by its author, led José Ortega y Gasset to emphasise the specificity of literary translation as a separate literary genre, distinct from the genre of literary works (1964, 449). As previously stressed though, translation is interpretation; this is why the translator can have a space of creativity depending on his or her interpretation of the source text and on his or her poesis or creation of the target text, i.e. on his or her translating poesis, or translation poetics (Barnstone 1993; Meschonnic 1999; Albaladejo 2008), within the limits imposed by the restricted

equivalence between the text-translation and the source text. These limits do not mean that the texts are identical, since they are not, especially taking into account the fact that they have been written in different languages, this precisely being what drives literary translation (Arduini and Hodgson 2004; Arduini 2004; Albaladejo 2004).

The text resulting from literary translation is a literary one, the same as the source text, the original work; and being a literary text, the text-translation has literariness at the same linguistic levels and semiotic contexts as the original one. It is a literary text where the translator has tried his or her best to reproduce the style of the original work. It is precisely the transfer and maintenance of the features, characteristics or peculiarities of the original work in the target language that makes possible a restricted equivalence between the original and the translation and, consequently, the representation of the work written in the original language by the text-translation in another language; or expressed differently, by the translated work. Literary translation thus permits a broadening of literary communication, projecting—as said above—the literary event where the target text appears in other communicative events by making possible or facilitating access to the literary work in its translated version for those readers who either do not know the language of the original work at all or have a knowledge level of it which does not allow them to fully enjoy its reading. As explained by Walter Benjamin in *Der Aufgabe des Übersetzers*, a literary work has a second life in translation; to which must be added that the translation expands and renovates the original literary work (Benjamin 1994, 287) insofar as it reaches new readers and even allows for new interpretations by readers who had already read that particular work in its original language.

The poietic translation strategy

The transfer of literariness during the translation process and the consequent maintenance of the status as a literary text in the text-translation will only be possible if the translator, in his or her interpretation of the original work, can intellectually detect the author's poietic strategy (Albaladejo 1992, 187) present in the original literary work and apply it to the poesis or creation which also constitutes his or her production of the target text. The way in which s/he has carried out the translation of the original literary work is as a *poietic translation strategy* (Albaladejo 1992, 191; Chico-Rico 2001, 274 ff.) within the communicative context of which s/he forms a part as a producer. Our use of the adverb 'intellectively' refers back to the rhetorical operation of *intellectio* (Chico-

Rico 1989; 1998), on which are directly dependent the observation and analysis of the overall communicative context of which the producer of a text is a part, permitting—in the case of the literary translator preparing to produce a text-translation—the explanation of the processes through which its author created the source literary text or, in other words, the process of identifying the poietic strategy adopted and implemented by the author of the work being translated (Albaladejo 1992, 185 ff.; Chico-Rico 2001, 274 ff.). Apprehending the creative strategy during the interpretation of the original work performed by the translator becomes essential so that the latter can activate it in his or her production of the target text. The translator therefore needs to achieve an intellectual detection of the devices used by the author of the original work as part of his or her poietic strategy, ultimately seeking to identify, apprehend and assume the author's creative action. The poietic strategy includes the aesthetic—linguistic-artistic—intention of the author, the choice of a literary genre, the type of recipient addressed, and the author's forecasts regarding the possibilities for the reception of the work and the possible attitudes of recipients towards it. Identifying the poietic strategy of the work which s/he is translating allows the translator to appropriate it, to assume it as a second producer of the work, as the producer of a literary work in the target language, and to transfer it in his or her act of production to the text-translation, so that the translation can be as equivalent to the original work as possible, understanding total equivalence as a desideratum.

Identifying the author's poietic strategy in the literary work comprises the explanation by the translator in his or her interpretative process, so that the *extensional-semantic code* can be maintained during his or her creative process (Albaladejo 1992). This code needs to be shared by the producer and the recipient alike so that their interpretation of the referent for the original text will match the poiesis or creation implemented by the author in the referential context and for the translator to be able to transfer both the complexity and the characteristics—referential as well as meaning-related—to the text-translation (Vidal Claramonte 2004). As a feature of literariness, the ambiguity (Catford 1974, 94ff) of the source text should be maintained by the translator in the text-translation, if possible. For Pina Rosa Piras, it is necessary to highlight the difficulty involved in literary translation, since the work has not only a linguistic code but also a variety of historical-cultural subcodes which have to be interpreted and transferred to the text-translation (Piras 2010, 50). In short, the translator—in his or her capacity as a producer—must act as an interpreter, as a

recipient, in keeping with the characteristics of the source literary text and with its production context in historical and cultural terms, so that s/he can behave—consistently with his or her receptive activity—in the best possible way during the production—the creation—of the literary work that is the target text, in which the translator needs to bear in mind the principle of restricted equivalence to the original text (Valero Garcés 1995).

The systematic practice of communicative exception

In literary translation, the status of the literary work subject to translation as a linguistic-artistic text is projected into the text resulting from the translation process as a linguistic artistic text in a language other than that of the original work. That status based on literariness, as explained above, has a linguistic as well as communicative nature and is shaped at the phono-phonological, morphosyntactic, intensional-semantics, extensional-semantic, pragmatic and textual levels in accordance with the syntactic-semiotic, semantic-semiotic and pragmatic-semiotic perspectives (Albaladejo 1992). Both the recipients of the original work and those of the text-translation recognise this status of the literary work as a linguistic-artistic object, as a language work of art, as ‘literarische Kunstwerk’ (Ingarden 1972), a status which implies exceptionality in the linguistic-constructive as well as in the communicative use of languages, both regarding production and in terms of reception. The explanation of literariness offered by Antonio García-Berrio assigns a fundamental role to the notion of *systematic practice of communicative exception* (García-Berrio 1992, 49 ff.; 1994, 81 ff.), according to which the literary use of language and the literary practice of communication constitute an exception with regard to the habitual linguistic-constructive and communicative usage. This exception becomes a systematic one, to the extent that it eventually comes to form part of the literature system, of its language and its communication, sustaining its specificity. Thus, the consideration as a communicative exception can be given to the fact that we do not demand from a literary text the precisions and certainties—the denotative meanings—which can usually be demanded from a non-literary text, that is, from a text which seeks a mainly functional and practical purpose, such as, for example, instructions for an electronic device (Franco Aixelá 2005). The systematic practice of communicative exception is transferred from the original work to its translated versions within literary translation.

Furthermore, the status as a literary work may meta-communicatively harbour

a systematic practice of communicative exception in the actual translation, which constitutes a distinctive characteristic when comparing literary and non-literary translation. Unlike what happens in literary translation, where faithfulness to the source text may be softened, that faithfulness to the original, especially in texts with clearly functional and practical implications—as in texts typical of everyday communication, but also legal, economic or historical texts—must characterise the text-translation, ensuring that the aforementioned faithfulness will not entail an alteration of the original text in terms of its meaning. Literary translation allows for the intervention of the translator, who can re-create the original text partially drifting apart from it, even though it would not be a translation *stricto sensu* in that case, but a version of the source text in another language, since modifications have been introduced in it. This is what happens, for instance, in the translation or version into Italian that the writer Carlo Emilio Gadda made of Quevedo's work *El mundo por de dentro*, which belongs to his *Sueños y discursos*. The Italian writer actually produced a text, *Il mondo come è*, in which he, as a translator and as an author, plays an active role with additions, comments, etc.—a case which resembles that of the so-called 'assumed translations' (Pym 2010, 76-7). This is possible in the translation of a literary text, but it could not happen in that of a text which has a clear functional or practical purpose, such as an instructions booklet or a patient information leaflet; hence the practice of communicative exception in some literary translations. Nevertheless, this would be a rather infrequent case, but it deserves to be taken into account as a possibility which remains open for the literary text in its translation, if the translator deems it appropriate, thus enhancing his or her creative intervention on the source text during its process of transformation into a text written in the target language. This is how some translations move away from the original text because of specific interventions carried out by translators (Albaladejo 2001). These interventions are not dissimilar from the interventions in non-literary translations in conflict and violence situations (Baker 2006; Albaladejo 2001, 2004).

The translator's intervention in translation that we have just described above has nothing to do with the case of literal translation, which is sometimes suggested as a way to respect the original text, even though it may bring about an erroneous interpretation for the recipients of the text-translation, since the effort to seek the proximity of the text-translation to the original text can result in just the opposite: a distortion of the latter in its translation due to an excessive literalness. For this reason, the flexibility that dynamic equivalence entails (Nida and Taber 1969, 22-28; Nida

2012) must play an important role in literary translation so that the resulting text can be accepted as its own in the target language—and culture—ruling out those translating options which, in the interests of achieving literalness in a specific translation, paradoxically move it away from the communicative functionality of the original. Helena Beristáin has expressed in a highly graphical way—utilising the Italian saying *Traduttore, traditore*—the need for the translation of a text to build another one which can replace the original, even if that implies drifting apart from the literal translation: ‘El “traduttore”, pues, no puede evitar ser “traditore”, pero puede elegir, en cada texto, aquello que es menos grave traicionar [Consequently, the “traduttore” cannot avoid being a “traditore”, but he can choose which treason is less serious in each text’] (Beristáin 2000, 140).

The complex linguistic-communicative competence of a literary translator

Whether the text-translation has literariness depends on the translator’s effort to identify the author’s poietic strategy and to appropriate it, to assume it as his or her own in the production of the target text and to transfer it to the resulting text. However, the translator must additionally own a literary competence both in his or her dimension as a recipient, that is, a passive literary competence, and in his or her dimension as a producer, i.e. an active literary competence. Only in this way will the translator be able to act as an author who, despite being a producer who starts from a previously existing literary text, is also the author of a new text, insofar as the latter represents a linguistic creation in a language other than the source language as the language of the literary work. As the producer of the text-translation, and thanks to his or her active literary competence, the translator reinforces his or her style creation capacity, albeit in reference to the style of the original work, which he has been able to apprehend by means of his or her passive literary competence (Gonzalo García and García Yebra 2005).

The literary status of the artistic text qualitatively lies at the textual level, towards which the literary specificity features of the various linguistic levels and semiotic contexts of the literary work are projected. Literariness is consequently a quality which fully materialises in textuality (García-Berrio 1979) and is also the textual awareness, both of the author and of the recipient, which supports it in such a way that literariness presides in the communicative process—the production and the reception—of the literary work. This implies that the translator, who acts both as a recipient and as

a producer of literary texts, works in an interpretative as well as poietic manner; in other words, creatively, on the basis of textuality. Literary competence is articulated both actively and passively through the textual status of a literary work. Literature—just like linguistic communication as a whole—has textuality as one of its characteristics, and the textuality of the literary work is linked to literariness, since it becomes linked in the production as well as in the reception—and, therefore, in translation, seen as a mixture of interpretation and creation—to a specific textual framing which makes possible the action—and interaction—of the features which are typical of literary genres as kinds of texts, as well as the features regarding literary specificity at the phono-phonological, morphosyntactic, intensional-semantic, extensional-semantic and pragmatic levels of the work when it comes to its implication at a textual level. Every interpretation of a linguistic object is undertaken from the perspective of textuality. Thus, by way of example, a reader cannot achieve a full understanding of a journalistic report until s/he reaches the end of the text, because the partial interpretations made during the interpretative textual processing have a temporary nature and can change at any time, from the progress in the interpretation that is being made. The same thing happens when interpreting works belonging to any literary genre, it being impossible to achieve a complete interpretation of a novel or a poem prior to interpretatively covering the whole work in its textual dimension. Literariness is thus connected to textuality when it comes to the interpretation of the literary work, where a key role from a textual point of view corresponds to the unravelling of its specific features and of its linguistic-artistic devices and, accordingly, to the identification of a style.

In the light of all the above, the textuality of a literary work is present and plays a decisive role in the translating activity, modulating the interpretation which takes place during that activity and its projection into the creation of a target text. Literary translation takes place within a framework of pragmatic textuality due to the linguistic-textual and pragmatic nature of the interpretation and production processes involved in it. Being a literary recipient who always bears in mind that s/he also needs to act as a literary producer, the translator keeps permanently active his or her awareness of the textual configuration that the work being translated has in terms of literary specificity. The literary translator translates and looks once again at what has been translated, after which s/he reflects on the best possible translation that s/he can make; s/he is not satisfied with translating while reading; instead, s/he approaches the work as a typical reader of what Dámaso Alonso calls the second knowledge of the literary work: the

knowledge experienced by the educated reader who acts as a critic (Alonso 1981, 203), as a reader especially interested in getting to know the work and in transmitting his or her experience with it, a reader whose ‘capacidad receptora es profundamente intensa, dilatadamente extensa [capacity as a recipient is deeply intensive, thoroughly extensive]’ (Alonso 1981, 203). This similarity between a literary translator and a literary critic (Guillén 1985, 353) is explained by conferring upon the translator a receptive and interpretative capacity which has to do with his or her special literary competence as a reader, to which must correspond a literary competence—in a poietic dimension—as a producer in keeping with the former. Literary competence therefore rests upon a textual competence (van Dijk 1976; García-Berrio 1979); both of them are comprised within communicative-textual competence, the first one being specific within the latter for the production and reception of literary texts. The literary competence of the translator as the producer of a target text is not identical to the author’s, due to the function of the original work as an essential and inescapable guide, which is why his or her literary competence must be suited to the reproduction or re-creation in the text-translation of all the features, characteristics or peculiarities which can be transferred to it from the original work.

Literary competence can only be acquired by having linguistic competence as the basis of the former, both regarding the producer and in what refers to the recipient. According to Antonio García-Berrio, literary competence is not symmetrical. As a matter of fact, the recipient may have it to interpret literary works and simultaneously lack that competence for their creation, which does not necessarily mean that the recipient is unable to have it as a creator. Because the translator’s activity implies that of a recipient and a producer, literary competence presents great complexity in translation. The literary translator is expected to have a literary competence as a recipient, but also as a producer, despite the difference between the productive literary competence of a literary author and that of a literary translator which was previously explained in this chapter. Thus it becomes essential in the literary translation activity for the translator—who is a recipient-producer—to have a two-way literary competence. Whoever translates a literary work acts, as highlighted above, as a reader of what Dámaso Alonso calls the second knowledge of the literary work, since s/he must be a reader who pays much attention to the work, owns a literary culture, taste and sensitivity and, thanks to his or her literary competence as a recipient, is able to unravel the work in every possible way, to make the most of its linguistic-artistic construction

and to acquire the best and deepest possible understanding of its poetic meaning or meanings. And also, as the reader of the aforementioned second knowledge, the literally translator acts poietically when s/he undertakes the production of a text in the target language, for which s/he has available a literary competence as a producer which allows the building of the text-translation at all its linguistic levels: making the right decisions with regard to rhythm and verse at the phono-phonological level of linguistic description, literary specificity features which involve a great deal of difficulty when translating poetry (Torre 1994; Bassnett 2004, 83-110); concerning the microsyntactic and macrosyntactic structures at the morphosyntactic level of the literary work; with respect to the construction of its poetic meaning at the intensional-semantic level; regarding its referential constitution at the extensional-semantic level; and in relation to the construction of its pragmatic and cultural dimension at the pragmatic level of linguistic description which ultimately comprises and determines all the preceding ones. The translator must consequently make important decisions as far as style is concerned.

Evidence of the difficulty associated with the translator's task is provided by the great complexity involved in the translation of metaphor, present in literary works as well as in non-literary texts, since it is affected by both linguistic and pragmatic-cultural implications which make it necessary to plan its poietic translation strategy, not so much from the semantic-intensional level where this trope is placed in strictly lexical-semantic terms, but mainly from the pragmatic level of linguistic description. As is well known, metaphor plays a key role in literature, and its translation includes recognising and reviewing the whole sense formed by other literary works, which constitute the textual tradition as a context (García-Berrio 1978). The translation of metaphor implies a hermeneutical-poietic effort on the part of the translator, who makes the cognitive journey of metaphorical creation (Arduini 2000, 2007; Vidal Claramonte 2004; Fouces González 2007; Newmark 2010, 147-59; Guldin 2016), both to identify and to re-create this trope. This dual literary competence of the translator is supported by his or her dual linguistic competence as a recipient and as a producer, which becomes essential but does not suffice for the interpretation of the literary work and the production of the text-translation, both of which require culture, a broad knowledge about literature and authors, together with a literary taste and sensitivity, as well as the literary competence mentioned above. Combining an excellent mastery of both the source and the target language with the most complete possible literary competence holds the key to literary translation (Valero Garcés 1995; Gonzalo García and García

Yebra 2005).

Translations of literary works—insofar as they help in the dissemination of such works—make it possible to newly activate the literary competence of readers, who perform the reception and interpretation of works in the target languages, as translated works, regardless of whether they know the language of the original work or have an insufficient knowledge of it, and when, being familiar with the work and having even read it in its original language, they experience the reception of a literary work in a translated version, which raises reflections about the work which perhaps would not have emerged if the reader had not read the translation in addition to the original (Schilly 2003).

The pragmatic effect of the translation of the literary text

The pragmatic effect of the result of the translation of a literary text is very important owing to the role of recipients regarding the translated text. The literary translator intends that the translation of the literary work creates on the readers an equivalent effect to that produced by the original work on the recipients in the source language. The goal of the translator as to this effect is that the translated work produces a perlocutionary effect from the linguistic-artistic construction of the work, from its referential constitution and from its imaginary projection, in a similar way to the original work. Thus, an achievement of a literary translation is that the recipient is able to experience admiration for the work from the point of view of its poetic expressiveness, as well as interest in the story from the perspective of its mimetic fictionality and the need to think about, in the realm of its imaginary construction, certain questions on the human condition, individuality and society, world and nature, life and death. This admiration should be equivalent to that experienced by the reader of the original work. Poetic expressiveness, mimetic fictionality and imaginary construction are, according to Antonio García-Berrio, as written above, the three basic properties of the poetic text, the three specific modes or possible textual forms of poeticity as an aesthetic value of the work (García-Berrio 1979; 1985, 49 ff.; 1987; 1994, 15-6, 28, 42-3, 51-140, 327-70; García-Berrio and Hernández Fernández 1988, 69-71). In this regard, literary translation as a communicative activity has a perlocutionary dimension of a rhetorical foundation owing to the persuasion—and conviction—that is intended towards the recipients of the text-translation as to the acceptance of the translation and of its relationship with the original work.

The connection between translation and rhetoric (Arduini 1966; Chico-Rico 2001, 2002; Moreno Hernández 2010) is based upon this perlocutionary performance in which linguistic-artistic, referential and communicative devices that link producers and recipients by means of the translator's position and function as recipient and producer are activated.

The literary translator reflects on their translation and its perlocutionary effect and sets hypotheses about it by considering the effect of the work they are translating (Eco 2003, 79-81). The perlocutionary effect of the original work has a historical dimension that its translator must value to project their knowledge of it onto the process of translation and consequently onto the text-translation as a result of that process. Thence, it is necessary that the translator knows and, if possible, rebuilds and projects on the translation the communicative, historical, social, political and cultural context of the original work. This is because the translator creates again—i.e., re-creates—in the target language not only the literary work as a text-translation, but also the relations of the work with its recipients, in such a way that the translator rebuilds by their productive—i.e. poietic—activity the pragmatic structure of the work in its interpretative dimension. It is important to stress that this re-creation is achieved inside the text-translation.

The transfer of literariness in self-translation

The literariness of both the source text and the target text has a special presence in the cases of self-translation (Munday 2007, 206-16), that is, a process in which the author of the work in the source language and the translator into another language are the same person. Like in all literary translation, the transfer of literariness is also a core issue in self-translation. In principle, the identification of the poietic strategy of the author of the original work has less weight in self-translation due to the sameness of the author and the translator. Nonetheless, we must be aware of the different forms of self-translation. The ways of self-translational activity vary if the work is translated after a long period since the writing of the original text, if the work is translated by the author immediately after finishing it or if it is being translated at the same time s/he is writing in the original language. In some cases of self-translation, the difference between source language and target language disappears if both languages interchange their roles during the writing of the work and its translation. As Helena Tanqueiro (1999) explains, it is important to consider that the author who translates his or her own work is acting as a

translator of a work which has its own existence.

Self-translation allows us to approach the question of proximity between the author of a work and its translator. Translating works of authors who are alive is very different from translating works of authors who are dead. In the former case, it is usual for translators to consult authors about doubts arising from the original text or to ask their opinion regarding problems in translating the literary language, the meaning or the referent of the work. A collaborative relation between the author and translator (Munday 2007, 198-206) can be beneficial for the sake of the appropriate transfer of literariness and the equivalence of the source text and the target text. In the case of self-translation, it is interesting to think about the proximity of author and translator owing to their sameness.

4. The function of translated literature

If we think of the literary canon (Bloom 1997; Pozuelo and Aradra 2000) of world literature, of the great works that constitute it and are considered masterpieces by readers of different languages and cultures, we are sure that in most cases there are more readers who have read such works in translation than readers in their original languages. As it is well known, during the conversation held by Johann Peter Eckermann and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe on the 31st of January 1827, in which the author of *Faust* proposed the concept of *Weltliteratur* [world literature], he told his interlocutor that he was reading a Chinese novel written thousands of years ago (Eckermann 2005, 265-71). Goethe was not reading the novel in its original language, but in its translation into French. Marina Guglielmi stresses the importance of literary translation in Romanticism (2003, 313 ff.). Antoine Berman has studied the situation and role of translation in the German culture of Romanticism (1984). If we read, for instance, Leo Tolstoy's *Voyna i mir* [*War and Peace*] in its translation into Spanish or into English, we are aware that we are reading this masterpiece, albeit we are not reading it in its original language. World literature and the knowledge of it are indebted to literary translation (Moretti 2009), which allows the extension of works beyond the limits of languages and cultures.

It is possible to think that a form of pragmatic effect of literary translation is the influence that the translations of certain works into the language of a community or a culture exert on the literature of that language. Often, these translations impel and inspire the creation of new works that are influenced by the translated works. This

influence concerns several aspects of literature: topic, story, structure, style, etc. It is the case of the role played in the configuration of Latin literature by the translation that Livius Andronicus made of Homer's *Odyssey* into Latin in the third century BCE. As a more contemporary example, the translations of Stieg Larsson's *Millenium* trilogy and other Swedish crime fiction into many other languages have influenced the writing of crime novels in other literatures and cultures.

Many literary works could not have spread to other linguistic and cultural spaces if they had not been translated. Translation transports them across linguistic borders, it transfers and projects them to the spaces of other languages and cultures. These transfers and projections can even succeed in including them as a part of literatures of the target languages. Through translation, these works can acquire a position that allows them to generate responses and transductions with the creation of new literary works which are indebted to the translated works and, of course, to the original works. It is, for example, the case of Miguel de Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, whose first part, published in 1605, was translated into English by Thomas Shelton and published in 1612 (Forbes Gerhard 1982), and was also translated into French by César Oudin, who published his translation in 1614. The influence of *Don Quixote* has been very strong in English literature, and we can affirm that this literature has welcomed it in such a way that works like Gilbert K. Chesterton's *The Return of Don Quixote* or Graham Greene's *Monsignor Quixote* have been created (Albaladejo 2008).

Translated literature plays a decisive role in the construction of the literary canon. The inclusion of some works in the canon is often connected to the fact of their translation into other languages together with—and often a reflection of—their accepted value in their original language. Thus, the canon is linked to the translation of literary works and it is inseparable from the global system of translated literature (Heilbron 2009) in such a way that most languages and cultures do not lack translation of canonical works (Fouces González 2011).

Translated literature (Lambert 1980; Toury 1981; D'hulst 1981; Gallego Roca 1994) is an indispensable part of our literary knowledge. The translation of literary works allows them to live in spaces different from their original ones and it impels them onto a transcultural journey (Arcaini 1992) across borders. Literature in translation is an essential component of literary history and global culture; however, it is necessary to take into account the relations between cultures, to obtain and to arrange the necessary documentation for complete knowledge about the cultural, ethical and

political features and conditions of the original works (Sales 2006) and to pay attention to the centrality of some dominant spaces and languages, especially regarding colonial, postcolonial and metropolitan spaces (Selim 2009).

Translated literature is completely literature because of the presence in the target texts of the features and peculiarity of the source texts, in such a way that literary translations hold the same linguistic-artistic, referential and communicative status as the original works. The translated works keep, as much as possible, the artistic specificity that is characteristic of literary texts and they generate the recognition and acceptance of readers within their cultural consciousness of what literature is and what literary translation is and means. This preservation is achieved thanks to the translators' hermeneutic-poietic, i.e. interpretative and productive, effort, as well as to their culture and literary backgrounds. The incorporation of translated works into the cultural heritage of the target language makes it possible for them to be considered part of the literature which receives them. It is, for example, the case of the translation of biblical and classical texts by Fray Luis de León, that have been incorporated into Spanish literature.

The different editions of a literary work are considered, as well as the variants between editions and between manuscripts. Likewise, to examine different translations of a literary work is of a great interest for the knowledge of the receptions and interpretation of a work and of the reasons underlying variants. The translations of the same work are examined by means of comparative and contrastive analysis (D'hulst 1981). By virtue of the cultural awareness of translated literature, the readers—as well as the literary critics, who are necessarily readers, too—appreciate and value high quality translations which offer them works in languages other than the original ones, in such a way that they stand for the original works that are represented by translated works, in accordance with the principle of representation: *aliquid stat pro aliquo*. Original works are at the disposal of the readers through their translations. This does not take value from the reading of works in their original languages; rather, it opens an interesting field where dialectic relations between original works and translated works no doubt improve the knowledge of literature, of literary works, of authors and recipients, and of course of literary translators and literary translation.

The translations of a literary work play an important, informative role for the new translations of this work, since they can be reviewed for their skills and to avoid their mistakes. When the work of an author is being translated, the preceding

translations of his or her works constitute a context that the translator considers in translation. Likewise, the translations of works of a literary period or movement are a context for new translations of works of this period or movement. These translations constitute a literary context, like the love sonnets, for example of the Spanish Golden Age, which function as a context for the interpretation and writing of love sonnets of that period, in accordance with the text linguistic model proposed by Antonio García-Berrio to explain literary tradition as a context (García-Berrio 1978).

The existence of several translations of a literary work is due to the fact that translations are hermeneutic and poietic responses of different ages and different translators. Each age accomplishes its own translations since it needs to give its own interpretative and creative response to the preceding literature as well as to the preceding translations. Every new literary translation holds a dialogue not only with the original work, but also with the translations of this work into the same and even other languages. Among the numerous examples that one could mention, is the recent translation into Spanish of John Keats' *Endymion* with an exhaustive study of the preceding translations of this work from the English Romanticism (Olmos 2017).

Feedback occurs in the field of translated literature when, thanks to the translations of their works, the author becomes aware of some aspects of their own work that had gone unnoticed. It is not infrequent that an author's reading of a translation of their work impels them to modify the original work in later editions. Translated literature impels literary creation. It is important in the task of transduction in its dimension of writing literary works based on other works. *Retractatio* and *imitatio* are processes of linguistic-artistic and thematic influence of existing works on new works, and the authors of these new works can access through translations many works of other languages and cultures. Literary translation enlarges the communication of works and makes possible an increase of the reading of literature, with the consequent extension of the possibilities of transduction and, ultimately, of literary creation.

5. By way of epilogue: literary translation and poetics. Poetics of translation and comparative literature

Literary translation is strongly linked to Poetics as the study of literature from a theoretical and critical point of view. The traditional expression 'Poetics' was reactivated during the renewal of literary studies in the twentieth century and was used

contemporaneously with the expressions ‘Literary Theory’ or ‘Theory of Literature’. The difference between Poetics and Literary Theory is mainly connotative, since both expressions refer to the study of literature from theoretical and critical perspectives. While ‘Theory of Literature’ stresses the theoretical dimension, ‘Poetics’ holds a relationship to the ancient science thus called for the first time by Aristotle and keeps the etymological features connected to literary and artistic creation.

Literary translation offers important insights to Literary Theory and Poetics because the activity of translation illuminates the features and problems of literary language and its constitution, since consideration of the source text and the source language as well as the target text and the target language provides a testing ground for the possibilities of transferring the literary work from its original language to other languages. Many reflections concerning literature as creation and as an object of interpretation arise from the practice of translation as well as from its theoretical observation. Literary translation is an instrument for Literary Theory and Literary Theory constitutes a framework that supports many spaces and issues of literary translation.

If one stresses the etymological basis of Poetics and its concern with creation, it is possible to deal with a Poetics of translation which is able to explain the processes of translation and to adopt the point of view of creativity, i.e. a *poietic view of translation*, to explain the activity of translation as a poietic task (Barnstone 1993; Albaladejo 2008).

Therefore, the study of literary translation can be considered an issue strongly connected with Literary Theory—including the creative dimension of Poetics. In this connection, Literary Theory provides a set of notions and components tested in the study of literature for the study of literary translation while the theory and practice of literary translation offers to Literary Theory the experience of interpretation and creation through the transfer to another language within the need for maintaining the literary characteristics of texts. From its experience in languages, translation also acquires a role beyond languages in the poietic transfer from imagination and memory to fiction as a literary and linguistic construction (Amezcuca 2017).

Literary translation is strongly related to comparative literature. Original languages of the literary works are used in the study and analysis of comparative literature, but it is also necessary to use translated works. In addition to this instrumental role, as it is known, translations are a bridge between cultures and the literatures of

different languages become connected thanks to translations. Many influences from works of a given literature onto works of another are achieved through translations. As Guglielmi has stated, the relation between literature and translated literature is key for the connection between translation studies and comparative literature (2003, 313). Many of the issues we have dealt with above regarding the role of translated works in the literature(s) of the target language are also related to the connection between translated literature and comparative literature.

Comparison is a way of knowledge in every field of human endeavour, including literature. Comparing literary works, authors' attitudes, readers' interpretations, contexts of production and reception, rhythm structures, stories, styles, etc. is one of the best procedures to know more and more about literature and its position in the network of cultural relations, in such a way that literatures go beyond cultural spaces by means of translation and constitute a fabric where influences and interchanges enrich all elements of literary creation, communication and interpretation which are in contact. The role of culture in translation has allowed the connection of Cultural Studies with translation (Bassnett 1998).

Comparison is present in the realm of translation. The translated work is compared by readers and critics with the original work (Schilly 2003). The translations of a work into several languages are also object of comparison, and even the different translations of a literary work into the same target language are examined from a contrastive perspective (Valero Garcés 1995). The different receptions of works are investigated through the comparison of their translations. In addition, comparison is always inherent in the activity of translation as a poietic process: a translator needs to continuously compare the source culture and the target culture in order to achieve a translation and to build a text-translation that can adequately represent the source text in its translation by keeping features of the source language and culture and, if suitable, including features of the target language and culture. Emily Apter considers translation as a fulcrum for a new comparative literature since a translational process opens comparative literature and impels it beyond the spaces of nations and languages with the name of nations (Apter 2006, 243). Translation spreads a net over works, languages and cultures that reinforces the notion of world literature and the idea that all human beings are connected despite their different mother tongues.

6. Further Reading

Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone. A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

This book deals with the role of translation in comparative literature. It focuses on the complex relationship between textual translation and cultural one and offers a proposal of a new comparative literature that explain the impact of languages and politics on literatures within a global world.

Fouces González, Covadonga, 2011. *La traducción literaria y la globalización de los mercados culturales*. Granada: Comares.

This book deals with the increasing internationalisation of the publishing industry. It draws on the cross-border reception of literary best-sellers as a model to explore the displacement of literature through different cultural areas.

Gonzalo García, Consuelo and Valentín García Yebra, eds. 2005. *Manual de documentación para la traducción literaria*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

This book offers an interesting and complete analysis of the documentary tools necessary for the literary translator, including both theoretical discussions of literary translation, communication and culture and practical perspectives of documentation in the teaching and the practice of literary translation.

Schilly, Ute Barbara. 2003. *Carmen spricht Deutsch. Literarische Übersetzung als interkulturelle Kommunikation am Beispiel des Werkes von Miguel Delibes*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann.

This book offers an important analytical, critical and theoretical view of literary translation as a bridge between languages and cultures. It deals with the translation from Spanish into German of Miguel Delibes' novel *Cinco horas con Mario* and explores intercultural issues which are key for literary translation.

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 1995. *Apuntes sobre traducción literaria y análisis contrastivo de textos literarios traducidos*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.

This book is based on the idea that translating is not only a question of bilingualism, but above all a question of biculturalism. Topics range from general aspects, such as an analysis of the role of literary translation in the transmission of culture, to more concrete

aspects, such as the problem of poetic translation, the influence of context on literary translation, the role of the recipient of the translated text and the influence of extralinguistic factors in the translation process.

7. Related topics

Defining culture, defining translation; Meaning. Publishing houses and translation projects

8. References

- Albaladejo, Tomás. 1986. "Ecdótica y análisis del texto literario." *Studi Orientali e Linguistici, III (Miscellanea in onore di Luigi Heilmann per il Suo 75° compleanno)*: 559-71.
- . 1992. "Aspectos semánticos y pragmáticos de la traducción del texto literario." *Koiné. Annali della Scuola Superiore per Interpreti e Traduttori «San Pellegrino»*, II (1-2): 179-200.
- . 1998. "Del texto al texto. Transformación y transferencia en la interpretación literaria." In *Estudios de lingüística textual. Homenaje al Profesor Muñoz Cortés*, edited by Estanislao Ramón Trives and Herminia Provencio Garrigós, 31-46. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
- . 2001. "Traducción e interferencias comunicativas." *Hermeneus. Revista de Traducción e Interpretación* 3: 39-58.
- . 2004. "Similarity and Difference in Literary Translation." In *Similarity and Difference in Translation*, edited by Stefano Arduini and Robert Hodgson, 449-61. New York, Rimini: Nida Institute for Biblical Scholarship – Guaraldi.
- . 2006. "Traducción y representación." In *Corcillum. Estudios de Traducción, Lingüística y Filología dedicados a Valentín García Yebra*, edited by Consuelo Gonzalo and Pollux Hernández, 31-45. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- . 2008. "Poética de la traducción en el *Quijote*." In *El «Quijote» y el pensamiento teórico-literario. Actas del Congreso Internacional celebrado en Madrid los días del 20 al 24 de junio de 2005*, edited by Miguel Á. Garrido Gallardo and Luis Alburquerque García, 67-82. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Albaladejo, Tomás and Francisco Chico-Rico. 1994. "La teoría de la crítica lingüística

- y formal.” In *Teoría de la crítica literaria*, edited by Pedro Aullón de Haro, 175-293. Madrid: Trotta.
- Alonso, Dámaso. 1981. *Poesía española. Ensayo de métodos y límites estilísticos*. 5th edition. Madrid: Gredos.
- Amezcuá, David. 2017. “Translating Multidirectional Memory into Fiction: Antonio Muñoz Molina’s *Sefarad*.” *Translation. A Transdisciplinary Journal* 6: 72-90.
- Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone. A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Arcaini, Enrico. 1992. “La traduzione como operazione transculturale.” *Lingua e Stile* 27(2): 157-181.
- Arduini, Stefano. 1996. *Retorica e traduzione*. Urbino: Università degli Studi di Urbino.
- . 2000. *Prolegómenos a una teoría general de las figuras*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
- . 2004. “Similarity and Difference in Translation.” In *Similarity and Difference in Translation*, edited by Stefano Arduini and Robert Hodgson, 7-14. New York, Rimini: Nida Institute for Biblical Scholarship – Guaraldi.
- , ed. 2007. *Metaphors*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Arduini, Stefano and Robert Hodgson, eds. 2004. *Similarity and Difference in Translation*. New York, Rimini: Nida Institute for Biblical Scholarship – Guaraldi.
- Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict. A Narrative Account*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Barnstone, Willis. 1993. *The Poetics of Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1998. “The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies.” In *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 123-140. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- . 2004. *Translation Studies*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1994. “La tarea del traductor.” In *Textos clásicos de teoría de la traducción*, edited by Miguel Ángel Vega and translated by Héctor Murena, 285-96. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Beristáin, Helena. 2000. “Poética, retórica y traducción literaria.” In *Filosofía, retórica e interpretación*, edited by Helena Beristáin and Mauricio Beuchot, 129-41. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Berman, Antoine. 1984. *L'épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans*

- l'Allemagne romantique*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Betti, Emilio. 1975. *Interpretación de la ley y de los actos jurídicos*. Translated by José L. de los Mozos. Madrid: Editorial Revista de Derecho Privado – Editoriales de Derecho Reunidas.
- Bloom, Harold. 1997. *El canon occidental*. Translated by Damià Alou. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Campos, Haroldo de. 1963. "Da tradução como criação e como crítica." *Tempo Brasileiro* 4-5: 164-181.
- Catford, John C. 1974. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chico-Rico, Francisco. 1987. *Pragmática y construcción literaria. Discurso retórico y discurso narrativo*. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.
- . 1989. "La *intellectio*: notas sobre una sexta operación retórica." *Castilla. Estudios de Literatura* 14: 47-55.
- . 1998. "Intellectio." In *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, Vol 4., edited by Gert Ueding, 448-51. Hu-K. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- . 2001. "Retórica y traducción. *Nóησις* y *ποίησις* en la traducción del texto literario." In *Lenguas, literatura y traducción. Aproximaciones teóricas*, edited by Pierre-Yves Raccah and Belén Saiz Noeda, 257-85. Madrid: Arrecife.
- . 2002. "La teoría de la traducción en la teoría retórica." *Logo. Revista de Retórica y Teoría de la Comunicación* II (3): 25-40.
- Cohen, Jean. 1974. *Estructura del lenguaje poético*. Madrid: Gredos.
- De Beaugrande, Robert A. and Wolfgang U. Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- De Saussure, Ferdinand. 1976. *Curso de lingüística general. Traducción, prólogo y notas de Amado Alonso*. 15th edition. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- D'hulst, Lieven. 1981. "Les variantes textuelles des traductions littéraires." *Poetics Today* 2 (4): 133-41.
- Doležel, Lubomír. 1986. "Semiotics of Literary Communication." *Strumenti Critici* 50 nuova serie I(1): 5-48.
- . 1990. *Occidental Poetics. Tradition and Progress*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Eckermann, Johann P. 2005. *Conversaciones con Goethe en los últimos años de su vida*. Edited and translated by Rosa Sala Rose. Barcelona: Acantilado.

- Eco, Umberto. 2003. *Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze di traduzione*. Milano: Bompiani.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. "The 'Literary System'." *Poetics Today* 9(1): 27-44.
- Forbes Gerhard, Sandra. 1982. *Don Quixote and the Shelton translation*. Madrid, Potomac: José Porrúa.
- Fouces González, Covadonga. 2007. "Tras las huellas de la metáfora: una aproximación a la traducción de la metáfora literaria desde presupuestos culturales." *Hermēneus. Revista de Traducción e Interpretación* 9: 39-60.
- . 2011. *La traducción literaria y la globalización de los mercados culturales*. Granada: Comares.
- Franco Aixelá, Javier. 2005. "On the essential identity of literary and non-literary translation." In *Thistles: A Homage to Brian Hughes Vol. 2: Essays in Memoriam/Homenaje a Brian Hughes. Ensayos in Memoriam*, edited by José Mateo Martínez and Francisco Yus Ramos, 57-70. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.
- Gallego Roca, Miguel. 1994. *Traducción y literatura. Los estudios literarios ante las obras traducidas*. Madrid: Júcar.
- García-Berrio, Antonio. 1973. *Significado actual del Formalismo ruso*. Barcelona: Planeta.
- . 1978. "Lingüística del texto y texto lírico (La tradición textual como contexto)." *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* VIII (1): 19-75.
- . 1979. "Lingüística, literariedad/poeticidad (Gramática, Pragmática, Texto)." *1616. Anuario de la Sociedad Española de Literatura General y Comparada* 2: 125-168. Reprinted in *El centro en lo múltiple (Selección de ensayos). I. Las formas del contenido (1965-1985)*, edited and with an introduction by Enrique Baena, 439-77. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- . 1985. *La construcción imaginaria en "Cántico"*. Limoges: Université de Limoges.
- . 1987. "Qué es lo que la poesía es." *Lingüística Española Actual* IX (2): 177-88.
- . 1992. *A Theory of the Literary Text*. Translated by Kenneth A. Horn. Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- . 1994. *Teoría de la Literatura (La construcción del significado poético)*. 2nd revised and extended edition. Madrid: Cátedra.

- García-Berrio, Antonio and María T. Hernández Fernández. 1988. *La Poética: tradición y modernidad*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- García Yebra, Valentín. 1984. *Teoría y práctica de la traducción*. 2nd revised edition. Madrid: Gredos.
- Gonzalo García, Consuelo and Valentín García Yebra, eds. 2005. *Manual de documentación para la traducción literaria*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Guglielmi, Marina. 2003. "La traducción literaria." In *Introducción a la literatura comparada*, edited by Armando Gnisci, 291-345. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Guillén, Claudio. 1985. *Entre lo uno y lo diverso. Introducción a la literatura comparada*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Guldin, Rainer. 2016. *Translation as Metaphor*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Heilbron, Johan. 2009. "Towards a Sociology of Translation. Book Translations as a Cultural World-System." In *Translation Studies. Vol. II*, edited by Mona Baker, 108-24. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ingarden, Roman. 1972. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*, 4th edition. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Lambert, José. 1980. "Production, tradition et importation: une clef pour la description de la littérature et de la littérature en traduction." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 7: 246-52.
- Meschonnic, Henri. 1999. *Poétique du traduire*. Paris: Verdier.
- Moreno Hernández, Carlos. 2010. *Retórica y traducción*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Moretti, Franco. 2009. "Conjectures on World Literature." In *Translation Studies. Vol. II*, edited by Mona Baker, 125-37. London and New York: Routledge.
- Morris, Charles. 1971. "Foundations of the Theory of Signs." In *Writings on the General Theory of Signs*, 13-71. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Mounin, Georges. 1963. *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2007. *Style and Ideology in Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, Peter. 2010. *Manual de traducción*. 6th edition. Translated by Virgilio Moya. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Nida, Eugene A. 2012. *Sobre la traducción*. Translated by María E. Fernández-Miranda-Nida. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leyden: Brill.

- Olmos, Paula. 2017. "Estudio introductorio." In *John Keats. Endimión*, bilingual edition edited by Paula Olmos and Jorge Cano Cuenca. Translated by Paula Olmos, 7-79. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. 1964. "Misericordia y esplendor de la traducción." In *Obras completas* Vol. V. 6th edition, 431-52. Madrid: Revista de Occidente.
- Paz, Octavio. 1971. *Traducción: literatura y literalidad*. Barcelona: Tusquets.
- Petöfi, János S. 1975. *Vers une théorie partielle du texte*. Hamburg: Buske.
- . 1982. "Semiotica verbale, teoria del testo, teoria della traduzione." In *Processi traduttivi: teorie ed applicazioni*, Brescia: La Scuola: 97-113.
- . 1991. "Alcuni aspetti di una teoria della traduzione dal punto di vista testologico semiologico." *Koiné. Annali della Scuola Superiore per Interpreti e Traduttori «San Pellegrino»* I (2): 57-73.
- Piras, Pina Rosa. 2010. *Traduzione come ricerca. Storia, teoria e analisi dei testi nella traduzione dallo spagnolo in italiano*. Roma: Edizioni Q.
- Pozuelo, José M. 1988. *La teoría del lenguaje literario*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Pozuelo, José M. and Rosa M. Aradra. 2000. *Teoría del canon y literatura española*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sales Salvador, Dora. 2006. "Documentation as Ethics in Postcolonial Translation." *Translation Journal* 10(1). Accessed May 20, 2017.
<http://translationjournal.net/journal/35documentation.htm>
- Schilly, Ute Barbara. 2003. *Carmen spricht Deutsch. Literarische Übersetzung als interkulturelle Kommunikation am Beispiel des Werkes von Miguel Delibes*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann.
- Schmidt, Siegfried J. 1980. *Grundriß der Empirischen Literaturwissenschaft. Der gesellschaftliche Handlungsbereich Literatur*. Braunschweig and Wiesbaden: Vieweg.
- Selim, Samah. 2009. "Pharaoh's Revenge. Translation, Literary History and Colonial Ambivalence." In *Translation Studies. Vol. II*, edited by Mona Baker, 170-92. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tanqueiro, Helena. 1999. "Un traductor privilegiado: el autotraductor." *Quaderns. Revista de Traducció* 3: 19-27.
- Tonfoni, Graziella. 1982. "Dalla frase al testo: per una teoria linguistica della

traduzione.” *Lingua e Stile* 17 (1): 23-49.

Torre Serrano, Esteban. 1994. *Teoría de la traducción literaria*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Toury, Gideon. 1981. “Translated Literature: System, Norm, Performance.” *Poetics Today* 2(4): 9-27.

Valero Garcés, Carmen. 1995. *Apuntes sobre traducción literaria y análisis contrastivo de textos literarios traducidos*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 1976. *Per una poetica generativa*. Introduction by Aldo Rossi. Translated by Luciano Tosti. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Vidal Claramonte, África. 2004. *En los límites de la traducción*. Granada: Comares.

Acknowledgments

This chapter is the result of the research accomplished in the METAPHORA research project (Reference FFI2014-53391-P). We thank the State Secretariat for Research, Development and Innovation of Spain for funding this research. We also thank David Amezcua and Víctor Pina for their reading and revision of our translation of this chapter from Spanish into English.

¹ All translations are by the authors.